

(2355) Proposal to conserve the name *Filago arvensis*, with a conserved type, against *F. montana* (Asteraceae)

Santiago Andrés-Sánchez,¹ Mercè Galbany-Casals,² Enrique Rico,¹ Gerhard Wagenitz³ & M. Montserrat Martínez-Ortega¹

¹ Departamento de Botánica, Universidad de Salamanca, 37007 Salamanca, Spain

² Departament de Biologia Animal, Biologia Vegetal i Ecologia, Facultat de Biociències, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain

³ Abteilung Systematische Botanik, Albrecht-von-Haller-Institut, Universität Göttingen, Untere Karspüle 2, 37073 Göttingen, Germany

Author for correspondence: Santiago Andrés-Sánchez, santiandres@usal.es

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/642.22>

(2355) *Filago arvensis* L., Sp. Pl.: [add. post indicem]. 1 Mai 1753 [Angiosp.: Comp.], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: “*Filago altera* Dod. Pempt. by Inst. R. h. / *Filago vulgaris*, floribus per caulem sparsis Inst. R. h. Hist. Plant. Paris / *Gnaphalium majus*, angusto oblongo folio C. B. Pin. 263”, Vaillant (P), typ. cons. prop.

(=) *Filago montana* L., Sp. Pl.: [add. post indicem]. 1 Mai 1753 [Dicot.: Comp.], nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (Andrés-Sánchez & al. in Taxon 60: 575. 2011): “33 *montana*” (LINN No. 1041.8!).

This proposal complements a previous one (Andrés-Sánchez & al. in Taxon 60: 599–600. 2011; proposal 2008) and aims to prevent displacement of the widely used name *Filago arvensis* L., due to the

priority of *Filago montana* L. over it (Fries, Novit. Fl. Suec. Alt.: 267. 1828).

Linnaeus in the first edition of the *Species plantarum* (1753: 856) proposed two names for this species, *Gnaphalium arvense* L. and *Gnaphalium montanum* L., but in the same work (l.c. 1753: Addenda post indicem) he transferred them to *Filago* L. (as *F. arvensis* and *F. montana*, respectively). According to Greuter (in Boissiera 13: 136–139. 1967) these two pairs of names (*G. arvense* and *F. arvensis*; *G. montanum* and *F. montana*) are nomina alternativa.

The name *F. arvensis* has been in continuous use since 1753, but unfortunately there was a problem with the neotype chosen for it (Wagenitz in Rechinger, Fl. Iranica 4: 24. 1980), because the specimen formally selected is not in accordance with the current usage of this name. Andrés-Sánchez & al. (l.c. 2011: 599–600) submitted a proposal

to conserve the name *F. arvensis* with a conserved type, where details on the neotype, as well as on the selection of the aforementioned conserved type were provided. The authors of this proposal believed that the priority of *F. arvensis* over *F. montana* was established by Grenier (Fl. Jurass. 2: 430. 1869) but during the evaluation of the proposal the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants noted that Fries (l.c.) was the first to combine *F. arvensis* and *F. montana* and did so under *F. montana* and thus established the priority of *F. montana* over *F. arvensis* decades earlier (Applequist in Taxon 63: 1359–1360. 2014). The Committee noted that a new proposal to conserve *F. arvensis* against *F. montana* would be necessary and decided not to vote on Proposal 2008 until this new proposal would be published.

The current widespread use of the epithet “*arvensis*” [as *F. arvensis*, *Logfia arvensis* (L.) Holub or *Oglifa arvensis* (L.) Cass.] in Floras, weed reports and catalogues of exotic or invasive plants was illustrated by Andrés-Sánchez & al. (l.c. 2011: 599–600). Several additional works are provided here in which the epithet “*arvensis*” is used: Fiori & Béguinot (in Fiori & Paoletti, Fl. Italia 3: 275. 1901), Schinz (Fl. Schweiz, ed. 4: 674. 1914), Hayek (Prodr. Fl. Penins. Balcan. 2: 592. 1931), Rechinger (Fl. Aegaea: 611. 1943), Nyárády (in Săvulescu, Fl. Republ. Popul. Române: 243. 1964), Zángueri (Fl. Ital. 1: 691. 1976), U.S. Congress, Office Technol. Assessm. (Harmful Non-Indig. Sp. U.S. OTA-F-565: 303. 1993), Qaiser & Abid (in Ali & Qaiser, Fl. Pakistan 210: http://www.efloras.org/florataxon.aspx?flora_id=5&taxon_id=200023948, 2003), Uribe-Echebarria (in Aizpuru & al., Claves Fl. País Vasco: 527. 2004), Anderberg (Den Virtuella Floran, 2005: <http://linnaeus.nrm.se/flora/di/astera/logfi/logfarv.html>), Morefield (in Fl. N. Amer. 19: 445. 2006), Harms (Annot. Cat. Saskatchewan Vasc. Pl.: 22. 2006), Haeupler & Muer (Bildatlas Farn-Blütenpflanzen Deutschlands: 508. 2007), Jarvis (Order out of Chaos: 520. 2007), Blanca (in Blanca & al., Fl. Andalucía Orient. 4: 338. 2009), Flann (2009+ Global Compositae Checklist: <http://compositae.landcareresearch.co.nz/default.aspx?Page=NameDetails&TabNum=0&NameId=5880277a-b963-4097-aa13-7alc18b4bb2e>), Breckle & al. (Field Guide Afghanistan: 270. 2010), Alexandrini & al. (Fl. Modenese: 169. 2010), Mincemoyer (Checkl. Montana Vasc. Pl.: 14. 2011), Chen & Bayer (in Wu & Raven, Fl. China 20–21: 775. 2011; http://www.efloras.org/florataxon.aspx?flora_id=2&taxon_id=200023948), Jäger (Rothmaler—Exkursionsfl. Deutschl., ed. 20: 842. 2011), Tison (in Tison & al., Fl. France Médit. Continentale: 176. 2014), Tison & Foucault (Fl. Gallica: 512. 2014), Chikhali, Fl. Syria Online (<http://www.florasymria.com/speciesView.php?slId=34>), Pan-Eur. Sp. Directories Infrastruct. PESI (<http://www.eu-nomen.eu/portal/taxon.php?GUID=FCA6F88C-864A-4DA2-8126-19DF7B459D24>), Jani & al., IBIS Fl. (<http://flora.biota.in/flora/angiosperm/asterales/asteraceae/filago/filago-arvensis>), African Pl. Database (<http://www.ville-ge.ch/musinfo/bd/cjb/africa/details.php?langue=en&id=137527>), Mus. Natl. Hist. Nat., INPN (http://inpn.mnhn.fr/espece/cd_nom/98669?lg=en).

Rouy (Fl. France 8: 175–176. 1903) also accepted *F. arvensis* (not *F. montana*, as erroneously reported by Andrés-Sánchez & al. (l.c.

2011: 599–600), but already noted the ambiguity of the epithet “*montana*” and suggested that this name should be rejected.

Indeed, the interpretation of the epithet “*montana*” is problematic. Linnaeus (l.c.) included as original material three possible types: a sheet lodged at the herbarium of the Linnean Society of London (LINN No. 1041.8!) which taxonomically corresponds to the interpretation of *F. arvensis*; an illustration in L’Obel (Pl. Icon.: 481, fig. 566. 1581), which is not depicted with enough detail but according to Smith (Fl. Brit. 2: 873. 1800) and Andrés-Sánchez & al. (in Anales Jard. Bot. Madrid 70: 14. 2013) it could be interpreted as *Gnaphalium minimum* Sm. (\equiv *Logfia minima* (Sm.) Dumort.); and a sheet lodged at UPS (*Gnaphalium minus repens*, Bauh. UPS-BURSER 15_1_010 photo!), which corresponds to *F. pyramidata* L. Andrés-Sánchez & al. (l.c.: 2011: 575) chose as lectotype for *F. montana* the voucher LINN No. 1041.8. The fact that Linnaeus (l.c.) included three different species among the original material corresponding to the name *F. montana* has contributed to the difficult taxonomic interpretation of this name and to its historical scarce use. The narrow and ambiguous use of the epithet “*montana*” was discussed by Andrés-Sánchez & al. (l.c. 2011: 599–600).

Few other works published in the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st in which *F. montana* is accepted can be added to the ones previously compiled (Andrés-Sánchez & al., l.c. 2011: 599–600). Smoljaninova (in Schischkin, Fl. URSS 25: 323. 1959) considered *F. montana* and *F. arvensis* as different species, but used the name *F. montana* to designate plants which would be included within the variation of *F. arvensis*. Pereira Coutinho (Fl. Portugal: 617. 1913) and Nyárády (l.c.: 243) used it for *L. minima*; and finally, Jarvis (l.c.: 520) considered that *F. montana* should be used for the hybrid *F. arvensis* \times *L. minima*.

In this situation we still believe that nomenclatural stability would be best served through conservation, under Art. 14.9 of ICN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012), of *F. arvensis* with a different type from that determined by the strict application of the Code. Additionally, the historical ambiguous interpretation of *F. montana*, its rare use and the predominant use of *F. arvensis* are good reasons to conserve *F. arvensis* against *F. montana* under Art. 14.2 of the ICN and it is also the best way to serve nomenclatural stability. The alternative to acceptance of this proposal would be highly disruptive and would involve more drawbacks than advantages, given the widespread use of the name *F. arvensis* by botanists worldwide.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deep gratitude to Prof. J. McNeill for nomenclatural advice and constant help. This work was partially supported by the Spanish *Dirección General de Investigación Científica y Técnica* through the research projects CGL2011-28613-C03-03 and CGL2012-32574 and by the Catalan government (*Ajuts a grups consolidats* 2014-SGR 514).